

## REMARKS

This communication is a full and timely response to the Office Action dated January 26, 2009. Claims 1-32 are pending. By this communication, the specification and claims 1-17, 19-28, and 32 are amended.

In numbered paragraph 2 on page 2 of the Office Action, claims 1-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as alleged indefiniteness. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. However, in an effort to expedite prosecution and where applicable, the aforementioned claims are amended in a manner that renders this rejection moot. Therefore, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

In numbered paragraph 3 on page 3 of the Office Action, claims 1-32, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) for alleged anticipation by *Krivoshein et al* (U.S. Patent No. 6,446,202). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

As shown in Figs. 1-4, Applicants describe exemplary embodiments that are directed to providing and installing device-specific functionalities and information for field devices arranged in a distributed system. Device specific components interact with at least two functional units. The functional units are configured to store device information used to integrate the field devices into the distributed system. The device specific components include means for automatically install device-specific functionality and/or information of the field devices to the functional units for storage.

The foregoing features are broadly encompassed in Applicants' claims. For example, representative claim 1 recites the following:

A system that provides and installs at least one of device-specific functionalities and information for field devices, the field devices being arranged in a distributed system, wherein the distributed system has at least one device-specific

component that communicates with at least two functional units the at least one device-specific component having means for automatically providing and installing at least one of device-specific functionalities and information for the field devices that are stored in the functional units.

Contrary to the Examiner's position, *Krivoshein* fails to anticipate Applicants' claims.

*Krivoshein* discloses a process control configuration system in which a controller is coupled to numerous field devices within different device networks. The controller implements or oversees one or more process control routines and communicates with devices within the various device networks and with the host workstations to control a process and to provide information pertaining to the process to a user. The techniques described by *Krivoshein* is directed to the configuration and parameterization of field devices and controlling the exchange of data between a controller and field device. The data exchange includes how the data is organized and/or how the data is used. In particular, the controller includes a memory map that is used to access the information stored in the correct memory map location and in the correct format. As a result, without the memory map the information stored in the host workstation is useless because the structure and content of the information is based entirely on the layout of the distributed system.

*Krivoshein*, however, fails to disclose a concept that provides guidance on the installation of a field device as recited in Applicants' claims. Particularly, this reference fails to disclose a device specific component having means for automatically providing and installing device specific functionalities and /or information for field devices that are stored in the functional units.

For at least these reasons, Applicants' claims are not anticipated by the applied reference. To properly anticipate a claim, the document must disclose, explicitly or implicitly, each and every feature recited in the claim. See Verdegall Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of Calif., 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Therefore, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

### **Conclusion**

Based on the foregoing amendments and remarks, all rejections raised by the Examiner are addressed. As a result, favorable consideration and allowance of claims 1-32 and this application are respectfully requested. In the event any unresolved issues remain. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: May 26, 2009

By: /Shawn B. Cage/  
Shawn B. Cage  
Registration No. 51522

P.O. Box 1404  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404  
703 836 6620